

FOR PRESIDENT OF THE U. STATES.  
**HENRY CLAY.**  
ONE PRESIDENTIAL TERM.  
NO SUB-TREASURY BANK.  
UNIVERSAL EDUCATION.  
Retrenchment in the Expenses of the Government.  
REFORM IN THE NAVY, THE TREASURY, AND THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.  
Diminution of the President's patronage, by making more offices elective by the people.  
Appointment of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Post Master General by Congress, and the prohibition by law of the interference of officers of the Federal Government in Popular Elections.—HENRY CLAY.

"The Union of the Whigs—for the sake of the Union."  
FOR UNITED STATES SENATOR.  
**Hon. S. S. PRENTISS.**  
REPUBLICAN WHIG TICKET.

FOR CONGRESS.  
**Hon. ADAM L. BINGAMAN,**  
**REUBEN DAVIS, Esq.**  
FOR GOVERNOR.  
**Hon. EDWARD TURNER.**

FOR SECRETARY OF STATE.  
**Hon. DUDLEY S. JENNINGS.**  
FOR STATE TREASURER.  
**GIDEON FITZ, Esq.**  
FOR AUDITOR OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.  
**JOHN CRUSO, Esq.**

FOR CHANCELLOR.  
**ROBERT H. BUCKNER.**  
**JOHN M. MAURY.**

FOR STATE SENATOR.  
**B. R. GRAYSON, Esq.**  
FOR REPRESENTATIVE.  
**Capt. J. R. BURRUS.**  
**FRANKLIN DAVIS, Esq.**



"The above is a picture of our free institutions as illustrated in the different branches of business forming the great connecting chain which binds our Republic together. The 'UNION OF THE STATES'—'THE TEMPLE OF LIBERTY'—'THE CONSTITUTION AND THE LAWS'—'THE AMERICAN FLAG'—'THE HARBOR, THE PLOUGH, AND THE WORKSHOP'—all subjects which form the glory and honor of our country."

## YAZOO CITY.

Friday, October 18, 1839.

J. A. STEVENS, EDITOR.

Several communications intended for to-day's paper, have been deferred, to make room for editorial matter and advertisements.

We invite the attention of our readers to the Circular of Chancellor Turner, which will be found on the first page of to-day's paper. Also, to a well written article from the Vicksburg Whig, exposing the political conduct of General A. G. Brown.

"The Union of the Whigs—for the sake of the Union."

### Whigs of Yazoo—Attend!

Once more let us remind you that the day of battle is near at hand—that it approaches as if, at each instant, with quickened speed. But we feel that it cannot be necessary to awaken you to concert, union, readiness and energy. Already have you, in common with your whig brethren throughout the Union, numerical superiority in your county—the superiority which confers on Yazoo a lustre of patriotism, intelligence and fearless independence, not to be sullied or dimmed, even by the aspersion thrown on it by so high and pure a man as the Governor of Mississippi—even by his affectionately calling her "a Bowin Knife county." Already do we see the vernal "day bluish" of the whig cause "bursting on high."—And already do we seem to hear the spirit of your adversaries, instead of yours, moaning in sympathy with the chill November wind that, in its wild course, sighs in mournful cadence on all around.

But remember Whigs! that unless each and every man rushes with energy and boldness to the exercise of his noble right of SUFFRAGE—and unless, each and every whig voter sustains the nominated whig candidates of Yazoo and the State, all our anticipations may prove to have been but Fancy's dreamy picture, or, if realized, prove to be felt in truth, only as our own, instead of the loco-foco, fate. More than this, we shall not only feel the consciousness of having tamely submitted, without the proper exercise of the principle of self-defence, to our opponents, but we shall bear the stinging, bitter consciousness of having traitorously thrown victory away, when we were battling in the cause of our country's freedom. Three triumphal pillars can we erect to the election of PRENTISS—to the glorious liberty of Mississippi: Shall we, then, not do so?

Superior in numbers, as the Whigs of Yazoo now are, we know not what a course different from that of each man's voting exclusively the whig nomination, may achieve. Such different course may unfortunately liken our cause to the celebrated drop of Prince Rupert.

"The least part crack'd, the whole doth fly."

We must be careful not to abuse that devotion to individual sense of right or principle, a total disregard of which, so far as

they possess any of it, distinguishes the loco-foco. Favorable and distinguishing as this devotion to principle is to the whigs of our country, yet it has, we fear, been so far abused as to bring forth for its possessors more of evil than of good. We do not mean to recommend that degrading devotion to party, which sacrifices all virtue, independence and principle, and which so strongly stamps loco-focoism. But we mean to intimate that the whigs have, in their enthusiastic love of independent individuality of principle, forgotten the dictates of true policy, which, clothed with and equally recommended by virtue, ever attends principle. The law, which is the perfection of reason, cares not for things trivial and immaterial. Bearing all this in mind, the Whigs of Yazoo, throwing to the dogs all minor partialities and differences of opinion, surely will not fail, each and every man, to vote exclusively for the candidates of their own nomination. In this manner only, we are convinced, can the correct representation of the real wishes of Yazoo, the bestowing of her three votes on S. S. Prentiss, be achieved. And should the Whigs of Yazoo depart one jot or tittle from this course, and sustain defeat—the reason will be obvious, and their own blood upon their own heads and not on their enemies!

#### Our pledge and its fulfillment.

We solemnly promised our readers that we would prove that "Robert J. Walker was a tool in the hands of his party for the purpose of intentionally deceiving the people." The redemption of that pledge is in this day's paper, and we respectfully ask our readers to examine it carefully, and decide whether we have redeemed our promise to their entire satisfaction. Any candid man who thinks we have not we would be glad to hear him say so, for we intend much fairness and candor on this subject.

We remind our readers that this is not a question relating merely to Mr. Walker—very far from it. It is the Senate of the United States which we look at. And it is for the people to say whether Mississippi shall be represented there by this man of all principles, or by the trust-worthy, talented, honest and upright statesman and orator, S. S. PRENTISS.

#### Gov. McNutt and the Mississippian.

The Planters' Bank & its Notaries Public. We beg the patient attention of our readers to the following lengthy remarks in relation to an article, and a letter of Governor McNutt of September 24th, which appeared in the Mississippian of October 4, in reply to an article in our own paper of September 20th. The importance of the subject, and the fact that we have thrown the gauntlet, constitute our only explanation of the length of our present article.

We contend that the Governor is bound to commission any person duly nominated by the Planters' Bank to the office of a Notary Public for itself—not for the State of Mississippi. The Bank was originally allowed a Notary Public exclusively for its own convenience, when there were many Notaries Public existing as State Officers, as there are now many Justices of the Peace who are ex-officio Notaries. Such Notary Public was regarded as peculiarly a Bank officer, provided for by its charter in like manner with the President, Directors, Cashier, Teller, Clerks, &c., and may thus hold his office either for a limited or unlimited period, in the option of the Bank controlled only by the terms of its charter. Suppose the charter had originally prescribed that the President, Directors and Cashier should be commissioned by the Governor and hold their offices during good behaviour, would not this have been a right vested, an essential part of the contract, which neither the State Legislature, nor the Sovereign People of the State in Convention assembled, could have abrogated, without thereby violating or impairing the obligation of contracts, imposed by the Federal Constitution, so long as the State professed itself a member of the confederacy? The convenience afforded the Planters' Bank by the allowance of a Notary Public to it, as one of its officers still exists—the convenience is one of a private nature, prescribed by what is essentially a private act as contradistinguished from one that is public, and in its nature is a right vested, an essential part of the contract, which cannot be constitutionally annulled or taken from the Bank without its assent duly given. The Federal Constitution which provides against the impairing of the obligation of contracts, forbids it. The State Constitution of 1832, also forbids it, when it tells us: "All rights vested, and all liabilities incurred, shall remain the same as if this Constitution had not been adopted." Is then, the simple fact, that the officer of the Bank, who is its Notary Public, (provided particularly for the purpose of assisting the Planters' Bank in the management of its affairs) must receive a commission from the Governor, sufficient to render him a State Officer within the meaning of the 30th Section of the Bill of Rights prescribing limited terms of office. It is a known rule of construction that the Law must, if possible, be so construed by the Judges, that no part thereof shall fall to the ground, or be, in any degree, impetuous or void. Applying this rule to the present case, and reflecting on the high and holy importance of abstaining from the least violation of contracts and rights vested—is it not evident that the office of Notary Public, to the Planters' Bank, even if it could originally, by fair construction of the charter and its nature, origin and design, be deemed an office of the State, cannot now be so deemed? Is it not, then, evident, that the only

legitimate effect of the Constitution is to render the Notary Public of the Bank more emphatically an officer of the Bank only?

That the Legislature has not, since the adoption of the constitution, deemed the office of Notary Public, as previously existing, wholly unconstitutional, may be fairly inferred from the 3rd Section of an Act approved, Dec. 25th, 1833, in which it is prescribed that proof or acknowledgment of deeds of conveyance may be made before a Notary Public. And the late act vesting the powers of Notary Public in Justices of the Peace, does not expressly abolish the office of Notary Public. Nor can it be said to do so impliedly. The proper construction, it seems to us, would be to say, that the same powers are vested in two distinct classes of men, as upon reference to the above Act of Dec. 25th, 1833, the same power is expressly vested in several distinct officers. However, we do not mean to contend that the office of Notary Public, constitutionally exists in the way of a State or public officer. We mean, simply, to assert that the Planters' Bank has by its charter, a right to such a private officer, whom the Governor is bound to commission when duly appointed.

Again, as the Governor and the Mississippian seem disposed to stretch the 30th Section of the Bill of Rights so far, we would ask, if they do not deem that the High Court of Errors and Appeals has no right to appoint, or which is substantially the same thing, to license a lawyer for an unlimited period? A lawyer is certainly deemed by all an officer of the State; and he, as well as a Notary Public, is spoken of in the Statutes both before and since the adoption of the last Constitution—for by a recent enactment his tax fee is annulled. Take care gentlemen, or you may involve yourselves in even more disgraceful absurdity, if the thing be possible, than your leader the Hon. Robert J. Walker, has already done in regard to himself, by his great fondness for party letter-writing.

The Governor in his letter, informs us, that he has, since his coming into office, commissioned several Notaries on the nomination of the Banks, notwithstanding his then existing doubts of the constitutionality of such appointments. In the eye of strict construction, such as the democrats profess, was not this doubling sufficient to prevent the Governor from issuing the commissions, at least until he had duly reflected on the matter? Is it not evident that he thus violated his political faith, and even hazarded the violation of his oath of office? He then knew, as well as he now knows, that the Constitution precludes "any man or set of men from exclusive separate public emoluments or privileges from the community, but in consideration of public services."

But the Governor was then not so unfriendly to Banks as he now is. Giving to this clause of the Constitution the Governor would seem to place upon it, the State Legislature in defiance of the security of vested rights afforded by the State Constitution, and both the State Legislature and the State Constitution, in defiance of the obligation of contracts imposed by the Federal Constitution, might gradually lop off each part and privilege of a Bank Charter until no portion of the charter remained. In fact, the Legislature might annual, at its pleasure, the charter of a bank, without judge or jury, without reference to the stipulations contained in the charter itself, without regard as to whether any public service, in the way of a bonus, or otherwise had been or would be rendered by the Body Corporate, or not. All this, however, is consistent enough. The Governor deems that banks are a curse and a nuisance, instead of being capable, as the Legislature and he himself, at one time deemed, of rendering any public service. And this is the true basis of his refusal to appoint the Notary nominated recently by the Directors of the Branch of the Planters' Bank at Yazoo City. Governor McNutt tells us, also, in his letter, that "it would be in violation of every principle of justice to suffer any corporation or individual to appoint or nominate their own Notaries, and to make their certificate of their own acts evidence in their own behalf." Gov McNutt is an old practitioner of Law, and surely ought to know that the Law, which is the perfection of reason and justice, permits an agent or officer to give evidence in matters affecting his principal or employer, in which he is not otherwise interested. Frequently, as we all know, are bank officers called on in Courts of Justice to bear testimony in suits to which their respective Banks are parties. We do not contend that a Notary Public of the Planters' Bank is more than a bank officer or an agent. But this last assertion of Governor McNutt's, presents us with a fine specimen of the opinion of a man boiling over with prejudice against Banks, on the subject of justice in reference to Banks—and an opinion at variance with the clearly expressed will and agreement of the Legislature as contained in the Planters' Bank Charter, with the obligation of contracts and security of vested rights explicitly empowered by the Federal and State Constitutions, and with the long and well approved decisions and practice in the Circuit Courts, of admitting without objection, the evidence, such as it may chance to be, of Bank Notaries.

With respect to the decision of Judge Sharkey (Bryant vs. The State, 1st Howard's Rep. p. 355) concerning the Board of Medical Censors, we have no objection to make. It was founded on a public act—not, like any decision which might be made on the Planters' Bank Charter, or a private act. It had reference to those offices of a public nature belonging to the State—not to those

provided by its charter for the easement of the Planters' Bank.

In conclusion, we cannot but thank the editor of the Mississippian for the compliment which he has bestowed on our former article by simply and solely calling it "disgusting." He does not sustain the general character of his paper, which has long been designated by decent people as the "dirty sheet." If there is aught really disgusting in what we have previously said on this subject, it must consist in the general truth, that any allusion to a disgusting subject or person, however decently or delicately made, is necessarily disagreeable. But, the fact that the pretending editor of the Mississippian has, in the present instance, failed to heap on ourselves and our article, the quantum of foul abuse and low billingsgate so characteristic of ignorance and loco-focoism, cannot, we think, (and this without any vanity or undue assumption on our part) be justly attributable to his gentlemanly sensibility, or to aught else than the intrinsic and obvious decency of our former editorial. As it is, his failure to do so, is almost wonderful. As for the appellation of "learned," which the editor intends ironically to bestow upon us, we have only to say that had the word been printed in roman instead of italic, the intended irony would not have existed, and the public, so far as it places any confidence in the judgment of the worthy editor, might have accorded to us with sincerity the unmerited appellation of "learned." His wit thus seems to be derived from the mechanism of the printer, rather than from natural or acquired intellect. In truth, it seems to be literally italic irony, not *attic* wit. We would, finally, ask the attention of the people to the present affair of the Planters' Bank, as another proof of the equally degrading and dangerous effects of loco-focoism—the true spirit of which, sets at defiance all law, right and justice—all virtue, all wisdom.

#### Robert J. Walker and his "vindication."

We have promised to our readers that we will prove to them, from a review of this article, that its author is a tool in the hands of his party, with the use of which it is intended to deceive the people. We ask the patience of our readers while we proceed to redeem this promise, for a perfect performance is so easy that all men who think, whatever may be their predilections, shall be nailed to the truth, and those who will not think will not receive the testimony of their senses.

Mr. Walker's "vindication" is "from the charges of S. S. Prentiss," whom he says has "thought proper to charge me with a change of position on the currency question."

We had all along thought that this 'change of position' was notorious, and as readily acknowledged by Mr. Walker as we know it has been by his friends. But it seems that the lapse of five years emboldens the gentleman to deny it in toto. So we will have recourse to the testimony.

Mr. Walker says that the "charge is founded chiefly on my letter to Judge Black of 1st March, 1834." It is not true that that letter is the chief foundation of "the charge," as he is pleased to call it. It is only one item amongst hundreds of similar character, but we will take a look at it as we pass along. He acknowledges it to have been correctly copied from the original; and it is in the following words and figures.

Natchez, March 1st, 1833.

Dear Sir:  
As I promised at our parting to give you my views on any subject which might be interesting to your common constituents, I hasten to say that Mississippi will with great unanimity sustain you on the Deposit Question. In fact the public voice loudly demands a restoration of the Deposites, and the creating a Bank to supply a general currency. A State Bank can no more supply and govern the general currency than a State Government can direct and control the affairs of the Nation. Go on—your constituents are with you—the Country must be relieved from the frightful scenes of distress which have visited us. In haste as the boat is leaving.

Yours truly,

R. J. WALKER.

To a man of common sense it would seem that the language of that letter is plain and direct in its meaning, very free from ambiguity, and that it would require neither a deep learned lexicographer nor logician to decipher its real obvious import. But it seems now, that after a lapse of five years the language and meaning of the letter which lies upon its surface is not to be made use of, but in some deep recesses are to be found an interpretation for it more congenial to the political movements of 1839. Let us see what this new interpretation is. Mr. Walker says:—

"Now, does that letter prove that I was in favor of re-chartering the Bank of the United States or of establishing any similar institution? Does it show even that I favored the creation by Congress of any Bank whatever? It exhibits no such proof."

Well, if it does not, then it does prove that he falsely wrote that which was not his sentiments. For he wrote the letter, and the letter says so.

But if the letter does not mean what it says it means, what does it mean? Hear Mr. Walker further.

"It shows that I was opposed in 1834, as I now am, to the State Bank deposit system—that the people of Mississippi were in my opinion opposed to it—and that Judge Black ought to 'go on' in rechartering its adoption. The letter shows my belief, that the proposed State Bank system would fail, and that as an alternative to that system, was then in favor of 'creating a Bank to supply a general currency,' but by whom this Bank was to be created, whether by Congress, or by a union of a few of the States, as in the case of the Charleston Bank, or of a majority of the States, the letter is utterly silent. But here I admit, that as an alternative to the State Bank project, I was then in favor of creating by Congress such a Bank, with some modifications, as had been recommended by General Jackson in his veto and preceding messages."

And then, after quoting largely from Gen. Jackson and Mr. Jefferson, further to decipher the meaning of the letter, he says:

"This fiscal agency denominated by Mr. Jefferson, General Jackson and myself, 'a bank' is nothing more than the Independent Treasury bill, except that the bill is now proposed by the democratic party stripped of every feature of a Bank."

In the name of the English language—and in the name of all that is candid, honest and fair, was ever such an argument put upon paper! The letter meant then, that the writing of it, Mr. Walker was in favor of a Sub-Treasury!!! Reader, please to turn back and read the letter again, then read the interpretation again, and then answer us which the letter is most "in favor of"—the Independent Treasury bill or the funding of a city in the moon? Why the argument, if we may so misuse our mother tongue as to call it such, is torn utterly to pieces by Mr. Walker himself, and with a much more home and deeply thrust than we could do it, for he says that "the bill as now proposed by the democratic party is stripped of every feature of a bank."

We assure our readers that we quote Mr. Walker correctly, and give the whole of his interpretation of this, as he now seems to conceive it, difficult and mysterious letter. But reader, suppose we take off the glorification spectacles a moment, and look at this letter again with our natural eyes.

It was written to Judge Black, then in the Senate of the United States—Congress in session. What financial questions were then before Congress, and what political contests was Judge Black then engaged in—how stood he towards "the Deposit Question" in which he was exhorted to "go on?" Mr. Walker says he told him to go on "in resisting the adoption of the State Bank deposit system." But it is notorious that the whigs were battling for the Bank of the United States, and "a restoration of the deposits," as Mr. Walker himself expresses it. This is what Judge Black was doing, in which he was exhorted to go on. Mr. Walker, as he says in the letter, was with Judge Black on the deposit question—he says also, "the public voice loudly demands a restoration of the deposits"—Mississippi will with great unanimity sustain you on the Deposit Question." And still he says that he was in 1834, as he is now, "in favor of the complete separation of the government from all banking corporations, state or national." Though he was in favor of "a restoration of the deposits," he says further, "and here is it not a little remarkable, that the only measure of General Jackson's administration to which I ever declared my opposition, was the State Bank deposit system," and yet he was in favor of "a restoration of the deposits, and the creating a Bank to supply a general currency." He says, "I warmly supported in 1832 as in 1834, the veto of General Jackson upon the Bank of the United States. I opposed the re-chartering of that Bank or the establishment of any similar institution, as I now do," and yet he does not deny that he wrote the letter above which we ascribe to him! He urged Judge Black forward in the battle for the recharter of the bank of the United States, and yet he was always opposed to it and in favor of the veto! Why this is insulting to common sense. It is absolutely an insult to a decent community.

But we tell Mr. Walker and his friends that they have more to get over than this letter. Mr. Walker, at various times and on repeated promiscuous occasions, in Natchez and elsewhere, said a hundred times more than is contained in this letter. His common conversation upon the subject of the veto message and the removal of the deposits was an inveterate and hostile opposition to both. He was absolutely clamorous in opposition to these measures. He denounced them in the most unmeasured terms, and he as boldly and emphatically denounced Gen. Jackson, personally! He was in favor of the bill to recharter the United States Bank. He was in favor of "the creating a bank to supply a general currency," which he says the Sub-Treasury bill contains not a single feature of.

In further proof of our assertion that Mr. Walker is being made use of by his party to deceive the people, we recall the same witness, Mr. Walker himself. He has recently published twelve or fifteen newspaper columns to show the evil of banking, or the issuance of paper money, under any possible circumstances or contingencies. According to Mr. Walker of 1839 "the very system of banking is founded in fraud and falsehood." It is immoral, irreligious, dangerous to liberty, disadvantageous to the people—a great evil that can only be cured by its perfect annihilation. Nothing but an exclusive metallic currency is honest, safe, or advantageous to the country and the people. He entertained these sentiments in 1834 and in 1836, for he says he has not changed a whit of them this whole while. And yet in 1834 he declared to Senator Black in favor of "the creating a Bank to supply a general currency." (It was then an exclusive metallic "currency" that this "Bank" was to "supply!") And in 1836 he declared in the Senate of the United States in reply to Mr. Benton, as follows.

"If the prayer of the country could be heard within these walls, it would be, GOD SAVE THE COUNTRY FROM THE WILD, VISIONARY, RUINOUS & IMPRACTICABLE SCHEME OF THE SENATOR FROM MISSOURI FOR AN EXCLUSIVE GOLD AND SILVER CURRENCY, and such is not only the prayer of the country, but of the Senate, with scarce a dissenting voice. Say, if the Senator from Missouri could, by his mandate, as direct opposition to the views of the President, heretofore expressed, sweep from existence all the banks of the States, and establish his exclusive constitutional currency of gold and silver, he would bring upon the country scenes of ruin and distress without a parallel—an immediate bankruptcy of nearly every debtor, and of almost every creditor, to whom large amounts are due, a prodigious depreciation in the price of all

property, and of all products, and an immediate cessation by States and individuals of nearly every work of private enterprise and public improvement. The country would be involved in one universal bankruptcy, and near the grave of the nations prosperity would perhaps repose the mangled fragments of those great and glorious institutions which give happiness to millions here and hopes to millions more of disembarrassment from debt and poverty."

Not a word, a jot or a tittle of the above language, it will be recollected, does Mr. Walker attempt to deny in his "vindication." In 1834 a Bank must be created "to supply a general currency" for state banks cannot do it. In 1836 the annihilation of paper money, as sought for by Mr. Benton of Missouri, would be the very presence of destruction and bankruptcy—an evil that would beggar the people and reduce the price of property to nothing. In 1839 he says, "(in his letter of 24 June) 'I am against the whole paper system, against it as destructive of the morals, dangerous to the liberties and ruinous to the true interest of the American people.'" And yet in his "vindication" R. J. Walker has the face to rise up before the people and ask:—"where then is my inconsistency?" He says that he thinks now on the currency question precisely as he did when he wrote Judge Black on the 1st March 1834. His own words are "I have no opinions to change on that subject." and yet he now says "I am against the whole paper system." And then he was in favor of "the creating a Bank to supply a general currency." And long after he had doffed his whig mantle and was a regularly installed democrat, nothing beneath the heavens was so greatly and certainly availed as the exclusion of bank paper and the establishment of a hard money currency. Now he is as vehemently "opposed to the whole paper system." In 1831 he says he wrote a book in Natchez, urging the restriction of state banks to "our state bank only in each State, with auxiliary branches, (very good whig doctrine)." Now he is "opposed to the whole paper system," and has the modesty to state while receiving these matters in his "vindication," "I claim then the MERIT OF ABSOLUTE CONSISTENCY on this question!!!"

Do not laugh, reader, at what we are aware would be a very natural supposition under other circumstances, that we are writing burlesque. We assure you we are in sober earnest and quoting the same Robert J. Walker correctly.

He was in favor of "creating a bank to supply a general currency." In favor of "one state bank in each state with auxiliary branches"—with Judge Black on the Deposit Question." He prayed that the country might be saved from Benton's "ruinous and visionary scheme of a gold and silver currency." He is "opposed to the whole paper system," for "the very foundation of BANKING institutions is based upon FRAUD and fiction." He wrote the letter above quoted, to Judge Black—"sustained every measure of General Jackson's administration, except the state bank deposit question." He is in favor of the sub-treasury bill which is "stripped of every feature of a bank" and claims "the MERIT OF ABSOLUTE CONSISTENCY" on the currency question!!! Read that, we beseech you, citizens of Mississippi!

When Mr. Walker can make honest men believe that "a Bank to supply a general currency," which he advocated in 1834, was the embryo that has come forth the sub-treasury scheme, "stripped of every feature of a bank," then he may have "the merit of absolute consistency" in advocating every side of the currency question.

We had laid up for our readers some sport in looking over the Senator's great pigmy attempt to make out that "the banks" are opposing his election, and his brave challenge of them to the stump and the canvass. But we have already lengthened out this article much longer than we intended; and in excuse for which, we can only remind our readers that we are not exactly writing against Robert J. Walker, but against the opposition of S. S. PRENTISS, the upright trail forward and consistent statesman and orator, for the Senate of the United States.

#### GOVERNOR McNUTT

In the editorial columns of the Mississippian, in speaking of the banks which he voted for in our Legislature (THIRTY IN NUMBER) says:—"But it is asked why he voted for banks in other portions of the State [than his own district] We answer—that he could not refuse to vote for Banks in those parts of the State then destitute, after voting for banks in his district, then gorged with banks." Destitute of what? Destitute of what, Gov. McNutt? The "other portions of the State" were destitute of banks, were they? They were destitute then, according to what you say are, and were then, your principles and opinions, of the greatest curse that ever befell mankind. They were destitute of a great devouring evil, one that would ruin them, as you then believed. And you "could not refuse" after, as you believed; ruining your own district, to extend the same boon to them also!

These deductions cannot of course be questioned, if we correctly state the Governor's banking principles. Do we or do we not, gentlemen Van Buren editors!

#### Worthy of Universal Reprehension.

"Chancellor Turner refused to grant an injunction against the Lake Washington Bank. Judge Coulter refused to grant an injunction against the Vicksburg Water Works Bank. Judge Shattock refused an injunction against the Bank of Grenada. All these Judges are whigs. They appear to think that banks can do as they please, and are above all control. Kentucky, about twenty years since, by a legislative act, repealed the charters of about forty banks."

The above remarks are from the Mississippian of the 20th ult. We know nothing of the merits of those judicial decisions. But we denounce, unreservedly, and hold